

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 28 2006

PTO/SB/97 (08-03)

Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0851-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

## Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

Attorney Docket No. QUAC0006

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office

From: GLENN PATENT GROUP

Customer No.: 22,862

Tel: (650) 474-8400

Fax: (650) 474-8401

on 28 February 2006

Date



Signature

Della Revecho

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Attached to this cover-sheet please find the following documents:


1. Response to Restriction Requirement (4 pages)

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.8 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Application Serial No. 09/531,743

PATENT

<b>CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION - 37 CFR 1.8</b>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below:	
Facsimile Number: 571-273-8300	
Total number of pages (not including any cover sheet): 4.	
Date:	February 28, 2006
Printed Name:	<u>Della Revecho</u> Signature: <u></u>

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

First Named Inventor	:	Steven Jeromy Carriere
Serial No.	:	09/531,743
Filed	:	March 21, 2000
Art Unit	:	3627
Examiner	:	Andrew J. Fischer
Title	:	SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR FUNNELING USER RESPONSES IN AN INTERNET VOICE PORTAL SYSTEM TO DETERMINE A DESIRED ITEM OR SERVICE
Atty. Docket No.	:	QUAC0006

---

Commissioner of Patents  
Mail Stop Non Fee Amendment  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT  
DATED 1-30-2006**

The Official Action mailed 1-30-2006 formally required restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121. In response to this requirement, Applicants provisionally elect the

- 1 -

Application Serial No. 09/531,743

invention of Group IV (claims 28-30), only for the purpose of furthering the prosecution of this patent application.

**The requirement for restriction is traversed on the basis that the Examiner has not made the required showing to warrant restriction.**

1. Search

If the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions. MPEP 803. The examiner has not demonstrated how there would be any serious burden to examine, for example, claim 1 (group I) and claim 9 (group II), which include substantial identical language. The same reasoning applies to claim 1 (group I) and claim 17 (group III), and to claim 9 (group II) and claim 17 (group III).

2. Independent Inventions

Furthermore, the restriction requirement is traversed since the examiner did not demonstrate that the claims contain two or more "independent" inventions. MPEP 802.01. Restriction is permitted only if an application contains two or more independent and distinct inventions. 35 USC 121.

As to the restriction between groups I/II, groups I/III, and groups II/III, the office action did not address the required independence of the claimed groups at all. Therefore, without more, the restriction requirement is improper.

As to groups I and IV, the office action misstates the law in regard to independence. "Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects." (emphasis added) [Office Action: page 4]

Two or more inventions are related (i.e., not independent) if they are disclosed as connected in at least one of design (e.g., structure or method of manufacture), operation (e.g., function or method of use), or effect. MPEP 802.01. Thus, the examiner must show that the inventions are unrelated in all of

Application Serial No. 09/531,743

the following: design, operation, effect. MPEP 802.01, 806.06. The MPEP cites the following examples of independent inventions: an article of apparel and a locomotive bearing. Another example is a process of painting a house and a process of boring a well.

In this spirit, it is difficult to understand the office action's (unstated) reasoning that the stated claim groups are independent, since several of the claim groups use nearly identical language and therefore quite clearly evidence an operational connection. In fact, several of the claim groups present the same or similar subject matter in different claim modalities, e.g., system, means plus function, process, etc.

### 3. Examples

Furthermore, the restriction does not provide meaningful reasons and/or examples to support the conclusions stated therein. MPEP 803. For example, in paragraph 7, the examiner suggests that the method of group I can be practiced by another materially different apparatus than the system of group II, and namely, a system without a "user interface." However, claim 1 (of group I) requires "querying the user for an attribute value...", and as such, it is the examiner's duty to provide a more meaningful example of how the proposed system can query a user without a user interface (Internal or external to the claim) being involved. Relatedly, there is no showing that the presence or absence of a user interface in such a claim makes it material different. In the same respect, the examiner's reasons and/or examples are incomplete as to the independence of groups I and III.

### 4. Public Policy

In addition, it is in the interests of the Applicants, the Patent and Trademark Office, and the public to examine the inventions in one application. There will likely be considerable overlap in the examination and searching needed by the Office, or in the analysis of patents by the public, between applications or patents on the two inventions, as well as needless duplication of

Application Serial No. 09/531,743

files by the Office. Additionally, of course, the Applicant is subjected to duplication of time, costs and Government fees.

Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal or modification of the requirement under 37 CFR 1.143.

Applicant does not believe that filing of this Amendment will incur additional fees. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due to the Glenn Patent Group Deposit Account No. 07-1445, Customer No. 22862. Applicant considers this document to be filed in a timely manner.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael Glenn  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer 22,862